

01  
02  
03  
04 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
05 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

06 MICHAEL THRASHER, ) CASE NO. C07-0529-MJP  
07 Plaintiff, )  
08 v. ) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
09 KING COUNTY, et al., )  
10 Defendants. )  
11 \_\_\_\_\_ )

12 Plaintiff, a Washington state prisoner, is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this  
13 action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 17, 2007, the Court granted plaintiff leave to  
14 amend his complaint to cure certain deficiencies. (Dkt. #5). On May 4, 2007, plaintiff filed an  
15 amended complaint. (Dkt. #6). Having reviewed the amended complaint, the Court recommends,  
16 for the reasons set forth below, that the complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon  
17 which relief may be granted.

18 The precise nature of plaintiff's complaint is unclear. In his original complaint, plaintiff  
19 alleged that he had not received *any* medical care since he was incarcerated in November 2006.  
20 Now, however, plaintiff appears to allege that he has received medical care but he contends that  
21 the care has been inadequate. Plaintiff attaches various exhibits to his complaint that demonstrate  
22 that he has received a fair amount of medical care while incarcerated. (Dkt. #6, Exhibits).

01 In the Order granting plaintiff leave to amend his complaint, the Court advised plaintiff that  
02 mere indifference, medical malpractice, or negligence will not support a cause of action under the  
03 Eighth Amendment. *See Broughton v. Cutter Labs*, 622 F.2d 458, 460 (9th Cir. 1980) (per  
04 curiam); *see also Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106-07 (1976) (“Medical malpractice does not  
05 become a constitutional violation merely because the victim is a prisoner.”). The Court further  
06 advised plaintiff that in order to proceed here, he must allege facts showing that prison officials  
07 acted with deliberate indifference towards his serious medical needs and that if plaintiff wished to  
08 allege that delay in receiving medical treatment demonstrates deliberate indifference, he must show  
09 that the delay led to further injury. *See McGuckin v. Smith*, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059 (9th Cir. 1992),  
10 *overruled on other grounds, WMX Techs., Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc).  
11 Finally, the Court pointed out that plaintiff had failed in his complaint to specify when he requested  
12 medical care and whether the request was rejected or he was provided inadequate care. *See*  
13 *Arnold v. IBM*, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981) (plaintiff must allege facts showing how  
14 defendants personally participated in causing the harm alleged in the complaint); *Kimes v. Stone*,  
15 84 F.3d 1121, 1129 (9th Cir. 1996) (allegations must be sufficient to provide defendants with fair  
16 notice of what the plaintiff’s claim is).

17 The allegations in plaintiff’s amended complaint do not cure the deficiencies outlined in  
18 the Court’s previous Order. Although the amended complaint states in a conclusory fashion that  
19 prison officials acted with deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs, plaintiff does not  
20 allege facts that support this assertion. He states vaguely that the prison medical staff “continually  
21 [sic] refuses to provide adequate care” but does not provide names, dates, or details. (Dkt. #6 at  
22 3). Thus, plaintiff fails to allege facts that state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

01 Accordingly, the Court recommends that this matter be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. §  
02 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and further recommends that this dismissal count as a “strike” under 28 U.S.C.  
03 § 1915(g). A proposed Order is attached.

04 DATED this 22nd day of May, 2007.

05   
06 Mary Alice Theiler  
07 United States Magistrate Judge  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22